

THE DATE OF THE  
*LIFE OF ANDREAS SALOS*

LENNART RYDÉN

THE chronological data contained in the *Life of Andreas Salos*<sup>1</sup> are contradictory. The author, who introduces himself as Nicephorus, priest at St. Sophia, pretends to be a contemporary of Andreas Salos. According to the beginning of the *Vita*, Andreas came to Constantinople during the reign of Leo the Great, i.e., Leo I (457–74). Yet Nicephorus speaks of Symeon Salos, a sixth-century saint, as a man of the distant past.<sup>2</sup> Because of this and other chronological difficulties, C. Janning, followed by many later scholars, assumed that Andreas Salos lived not under Leo I but under Leo VI (886–912),<sup>3</sup> whereas I. Sreznevskij suggested that an original *Vita*, written in the sixth century, had been revised in the tenth.<sup>4</sup> Most of the contradiction, however, disappeared as it became clear that the *Vita* is a piece of historical fiction,<sup>5</sup> written in the ninth or tenth century by an author who, for reasons that have never been properly examined, deliberately dated his hero and himself to the second half of the fifth and the first half of the sixth century. Thus, the question is no longer whether Andreas came to Constantinople in the reign of Leo I or in the reign of Leo VI, or whether Nicephorus lived in the fifth–sixth century or in the ninth–tenth, but when exactly in the ninth–tenth century the *Vita* was written,<sup>6</sup> and why it was given the form of an Early Byzantine document. Let us begin with a brief examination of the *Life of Andreas Salos* as a piece of historical fiction and see how consistent its historical character is.

<sup>1</sup> BHG<sup>3</sup>, 115zff. My references are to the *Vita S. Andreae sali*, PG, 111, cols. 628C–888D (hereafter cited only by column number). This is a reprint of C. Janning's *editio princeps* in *ActaSS*, May, vol. VI (1688). For cols. 852C–873A and 848C–849A, see also L. Rydén, "The Andreas Salos Apocalypse. Greek Text, Translation, and Commentary," *DOP*, 28 (1974), 197–261, esp. 201–14; and *idem*, "The Vision of the Virgin at Blachernae and the Feast of Pokrov," *AnalBoll*, 94 (1976), 63–82, esp. 64–65. For cols. 744C–760A, see also S. Murray, *A Study of the Life of Andreas, The Fool for the Sake of Christ* (Borna-Leipzig, 1910) (hereafter Murray), 85–100.

<sup>2</sup> The author is called Nicephorus, priest at St. Sophia: 888C. Nicephorus is a contemporary of Andreas Salos: 637A, 648B, 660A ff., 677B, 837B, 873A, 881B, and 888C. Symeon Salos is a man of the past: 648A.

<sup>3</sup> See Janning's *Commentarius praeuius*, reprinted in PG, 111, cols. 621–28. As late as 1946, A. A. Vasiliev regarded it as an established fact that the name Leo that occurs in the *Life* is that of the Emperor Leo VI (*The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860* [Cambridge, Mass., 1946], 162), although it is hard to see how this can be reconciled with his view that Andreas' prophecies refer to the reign of Michael III.

<sup>4</sup> I. Sreznevskij, "Žitie Andreja Jurodivago," *Sbornik Otdelenija Russkago Jazyka i Slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk*, XX, 4 (St. Petersburg, 1879), 149–84, esp. 157.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. Gelzer, *Leontios' von Neapolis Leben des Heiligen Johannes des Barmherzigen Erzbischofs von Alexandrien* (Freiburg i. B.-Leipzig, 1893), intro., 13: "Der Tractat ist keine Geschichte, sondern Dichtung, gewissermassen ein historischer Roman."

<sup>6</sup> Several more or less precise dates have been suggested: ninth or tenth century, and more probably the ninth (Murray, 33); end of the ninth century (G. da Costa-Louillet, "Saints de Constantinople aux VIII<sup>e</sup>, IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles. 1. Vie de S. André Salos," *Byzantion*, 24 [1954], 179–214); ca. 900 (A. P. Rudakov, *Očerki vizantijskoj kul'tury po dannym grečeskoj agiografii* [Moscow, 1917], 228; J. Grosdidier de Matons, "Les thèmes d'édification dans la Vie d'André Salos," *TM*, 4 [1970], 277–328, esp. 278); not long before the date of the oldest extant MS (tenth century) (H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* [Munich, 1959], 568); after 920 (J. Wortley, "The Political Significance of the Andreas-Salos Apocalypse," *Byzantion*, 43 [1973], 248–63); middle of the tenth century (A. Ehrhard, in Krumbacher, 194); ca. 1000 (P. Maas, review of Murray, in *BZ*, 21 [1912], 317). These suggestions, however, are based on rather general observations. The aim of this paper is to provide evidence for a more reliable dating of the *Vita*.

I. THE *Life of Andreas Salos* AS HISTORICAL FICTION

Like many other *Vitae*, the *Life of Andreas Salos* starts with an indication of place and time: Constantinople in the reign of Leo the Christ-loving and Great (629D). The emperor whom Nicephorus has in mind is certainly Leo I, who was designated as "the Great," i.e., the elder, when his grandson Leo II became coemperor.<sup>7</sup> Being a strong supporter of the Chalcedonian creed, he could with good reason be called φιλόχριστος by an orthodox writer. Nicephorus mentions Leo twice again (640A and 744A), thus reminding the reader of the chronological frame indicated at the beginning. In the former of these passages Nicephorus says that, because of his supposed madness, Andreas was sent to the church of the martyr Anastasia "which the pious Leo Makelles had built."<sup>8</sup> This is not quite correct since this building is older, but Nicephorus may refer to the fact that it did not receive the relics of St. Anastasia until the reign of Leo I.<sup>9</sup> In the latter passage he speaks of Daniel Stylites (d. 493) as a contemporary of Andreas, saying that Andreas had a vision in which he went to see Daniel at Anaplous just as Leo and his Augusta used to do.<sup>10</sup> Later on, he tells the story of how the protective force of the Virgin's *maphorion* was revealed to Andreas during a nocturnal doxology in the Holy Soros at Blachernae (848Cff.).<sup>11</sup> This seems to be part of the historical setting as well, for it was in the time of Leo I, people said, that the *maphorion* was discovered and deposited in the Holy Soros at Blachernae, which Leo had built especially for this purpose. Andreas' intimate friend Epiphanius, a pious young man of noble birth, plays a particularly important role in the chronological structure of the *Vita*. On three occasions, 657B, 729B, and 884D, Andreas predicts that Epiphanius will become bishop of Constantinople, and at the end of the work Nicephorus mentions Epiphanius τοῦ γεγονότος ἐνθάδε ἀρχιερέως as his source of information for things he has not seen with his own eyes (888C). No doubt Nicephorus has the Epiphanius in mind that became bishop of Constantinople in 520.

Nicephorus also refers to a number of people who lived before Leo I, namely, Julian the Apostate (877A), St. Hippolytus (865C), St. Athanasius (684C), St. Basil the Great (873B), Arius (824B), the martyr Babylas (877A), and Theodore, a young man from Antioch who was tortured by Julian the Apostate (877Bff.).<sup>12</sup> These names fit the historical setting without contributing to an

<sup>7</sup> J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian* (London, 1923; repr. 1958), I, 323 note 1.

<sup>8</sup> The variant reading in Janning's note agrees with the text of the best MSS.

<sup>9</sup> Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, I (Leipzig, 1883), 111 lines 7–9; see also L. Rydén, "A Note on Some References to the Church of St. Anastasia in Constantinople in the Tenth Century," *Byzantion*, 44 (1974), 198–201.

<sup>10</sup> St. Neophytus (d. 1214) seems to refer to the *Life of Andreas Salos*, and especially to this passage, when he says that Gennadius I, bishop of Constantinople (458–71), was in the prime of life under Leo the Great, when Daniel stood on his pillar at Anaplous and Andreas Salos played the fool; see Neophytus' encomium on Gennadius in the edition of H. Delehaye, in *AnalBoll*, 26 (1907), 221–28, esp. 221 line 29 ff., with Delehaye's remarks on p. 295.

<sup>11</sup> For a commentary on this episode, see Rydén, "The Vision of the Virgin" (*supra*, note 1).

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., Theophanes, *op. cit.*, 52 line 29.

exact dating. The same applies to the fact that Nicephorus mentions a number of public places, secular buildings, monuments, and churches which had been created before the middle of the fifth century and thus existed in the days of Leo I: the Forum of Constantine the Great (712B, 748C, 749A, 837C, 868B); the Forum of Bous (688A); the Neorion<sup>13</sup> (776C); the Great Palace (800Cf.); the Hippodrome (780C, 849B); the Senate House (748C); the column of Constantine the Great (837C, 868B); the weather vane of Theodosius I<sup>14</sup> (749A); St. Sophia (781B, 788D, 864C, 868B, 888C); the churches of the martyrs Acacius<sup>15</sup> (841Cff.), Agathonicus<sup>16</sup> (804B), and Thyrsus<sup>17</sup> (833A ff.); and the chapel of SS. Peter and Paul,<sup>18</sup> built by Constantine the Great, people said (740B). The churches of St. Mary in Chalkoprateia and of St. John the Baptist, also mentioned in the *Vita* (785A and 844A), appear to be closely connected with the period in which Andreas is supposed to have lived, although Nicephorus does not exploit them for the purpose of dating. The former was built in the middle of the fifth century. It may even have been dedicated by Leo's wife, Verina.<sup>19</sup> The latter may be identical with the famous Studios church, completed in 463 or, perhaps more likely, with St. John the Baptist ἐν τῇ Ὁφείῳ, built, it is said, by Anastasius I (491–518).<sup>20</sup> The Staurion (749B) and the Artopoleia (648C, 657A, 708B) may not have been known as topographical names as early as the fifth century, but, on the other hand, it is not likely that Nicephorus' contemporaries found them anachronistic. The Artopo-

<sup>13</sup> The oldest harbor of Constantinople; see R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, AOC, 2nd ed., IVa (Paris, 1964), 235f., 396f.; H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècles* (Paris, 1966), 430.

<sup>14</sup> Built by Theodosius the Great; see C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312–1453. Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1972), 44 note 114. The name Anemodoulion, however, which Nicephorus uses in the *Vita*, does not seem to be the original. See *infra*, p. 136.

<sup>15</sup> Known from 359 on; see G. Prinzing and P. Speck, "Fünf Lokalitäten in Konstantinopel," in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels*, ed. H.-G. Beck (Munich, 1973), 179–227, esp. 189.

<sup>16</sup> In the tenth century, St. Agathonicus was supposed to have been built by Constantine the Great, but presumably it was built somewhat later; see R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, I. *Le siège de Constantinople*, 3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1953), 11f.; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1974), 396.

<sup>17</sup> Janin, *Eglises*, 257, thinks that Nicephorus here mentions an otherwise unknown church, situated near the portico called *ta Maurianou* in the tenth century. However, Nicephorus does not say that the church of St. Thyrsus was standing near *ta Maurianou*. He simply says that it was St. Thyrsus' Day and that Andreas was near *ta Maurianou* when he happened to see a man returning from the church of this Saint. There is no reason to doubt that Nicephorus has in mind the usual church of St. Thyrsus, which stood close to the Helenianae palace and was built ca. 400. See Janin, *Eglises*, 256; and V. Tiftixoglou, "Die Helenianai nebst einigen anderen Besitzungen im Vorfeld des frühen Konstantinopel," in *Studien*, ed. Beck, 49–120, esp. 57f.

<sup>18</sup> According to Andreas' prophecy (741A/B), a pious ruler will reconstruct this chapel and provide it with five domes. Nicephorus seems to have in mind the church of the Holy Apostles, which was changed in this way by Justinian I, although it was not just a chapel but a large basilica and was not called Peter and Paul; cf. Grosdidier de Matons, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 307 note 104. See also *infra*, pp. 140–41.

<sup>19</sup> Janin, *Eglises*, 246.

<sup>20</sup> Th. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, I–II (Leipzig, 1901–7; repr. New York, 1975), 235. St. John the Baptist ἐν τῇ Ὁφείῳ was situated near the church of St. Acacius, which appears in the same context, and it was also close to the church of the martyr Anastasia mentioned above. It is therefore more in line with the topographical context than the Studios church, although it does not fit the chronological frame of the *Vita* quite as well.



leia appear in the *Parastaseis*,<sup>21</sup> compiled during the reign of Constantine V (741–75). The Staurion appears in the stories of the translation of the body of St. Stephen, the first martyr, and in the *Vita* of the martyr Acacius, to whom one of the oldest churches of Constantinople was dedicated.<sup>22</sup>

Nicephorus says that he had known Andreas Salos and Epiphanius personally, thus pretending that the *Vita* was written in the sixth century. In this way he could make the *Vita* more credible and prevent embarrassing questions, such as: “How do you know all this about a saint that lived hundreds of years ago?” As everyone knows, Early Byzantine books were written in uncial script, whereas books produced during the Macedonian period, in which Nicephorus actually belonged, were normally written in minuscule script. Did Nicephorus consider this fact when he chose the sixth century as the fictitious date of composition of the *Vita*? I think he did, since otherwise the contrast between the historical fiction and the form of the autograph would have been too obvious. My guess is that Nicephorus used the same device as Photius, who was supposed to have invented a noble pedigree for Basil I and prophesied that Basil should reign happier and longer than any of his predecessors. According to Nicetas Paphlago,<sup>23</sup> Photius wrote the prophecy and Basil’s genealogy on old papyrus leaves with Alexandrian, i.e., uncial letters, carefully imitating the ancient handwriting. He provided the leaves with old covers taken from an old book and put the whole thing in the imperial library.<sup>24</sup> In the same way, it seems to me, Nicephorus pretended that he had discovered a hitherto unknown document in a library where old books were kept, ideally in the patriarchal library. At any rate, among the hundred or so extant MSS containing the *Life of Andreas Salos* there is an uncial fragment consisting of eight parchment leaves appearing as flyleaves in Monacensis gr. 443, a paper codex of the fourteenth century. The fragment was discovered by A. Ehrhard, who dated it to the tenth century and identified the text as the section 745B–757C of our *Vita*. He also assumed that the MS originally contained the whole *Vita* and no other text.<sup>25</sup> If this assumption is correct, it is a fair guess that the surviving fragment was the tenth quire of a codex consisting of twenty quires or 160 folios, judging from the size of the preserved section and its place in the *Vita*. The writing can be studied on the photo reproduced here, as well as on a photo of two pages of the fragment added at the end of Sara Murray’s study.<sup>26</sup> It may be classed as a variant of the archaizing Coptic or Alexandrian uncial used in headings, indices, and other special cases after the minuscule had been introduced in the ninth century. The individual letters seem to have been formed with relative ease, but taken as a whole the writing looks coarse and irregular, as if the author

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 44ff.

<sup>22</sup> Prinzing and Speck, *op. cit.*, 182, 188; Dagron, *op. cit.*, 393–95, 404–5.

<sup>23</sup> *Vita Ignatii*, PG, 105, cols. 565C–568A.

<sup>24</sup> For a paleographical commentary on this interesting passage, see G. Cavallo, Γράμματα Ἀλεξανδρινά, *JÖB*, 24 (1975), 23–54.

<sup>25</sup> A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, I, TU, 50 (Leipzig, 1937), 81–82.

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.* (*supra*, note 1).

was accustomed to writing single uncial letters but not to using them in continuous script. The quality of the text is better than that of any minuscule MS of the *Vita* so far known to me. The context is clear. There are no obvious additions or omissions. One can hardly escape the impression that the codex to which the remaining leaves belonged was the autograph of Nicephorus. It is true that the orthography is irregular; e.g., in the two columns reproduced here, β stands for υ (Σταβρίω), ε for αι (διανείμε), ο for ω (ὄν, ἡττόμενος, βλέπον), ω for ο (διωρατικῶ), ι for η (εἰρικῶς) and ει (φιδωλός), and η for ι (πολητῶν) and ει (βίωση, πάθη). It is also true that the text of the fragment does not always conform with traditional grammar. In the same two columns, κινούντας appears instead of κινούντα, ἐν instead of ἐπὶ (ἐν εὐλαβείᾳ ἐπευφημιζόμενον), and ἐπὶ instead of ἐν (ἐπὶ τῇ βιώσει αὐτοῦ εὐλαβῆς ὑπῆρχεν). In column 1 ἐπευφημιζόμενον is unexpectedly coordinated with κινούντας, and in column 2 the coordination of μαινόμενος and βλέπων is equally unexpected. In the other folios of the fragment there are similar cases in which καί and τε are used superfluously.<sup>27</sup> There are also cases in which the accusative appears instead of the nominative<sup>28</sup> or the dative,<sup>29</sup> and the dative instead of the accusative.<sup>30</sup> But, as is well known, such orthographical and grammatical peculiarities are typical of lowbrow texts. Far from making the uncial fragment dubious, they show that it is written in a language that agrees with the general character of the *Vita*. Furthermore, two passages which at first seemed corrupt have proved to be acceptable on closer inspection. The first is on the reproduced folio, in the middle of the first column. The context requires that the words μεθ' ἑτέρου τινός should be connected with λόγον κινούντας, yet they appear to be connected with ἐπευφημιζόμενον and separated from where they actually belong by a colon and a καί. The difficulty disappears if one keeps in mind that the καί stands between two participles and that the author often inserts a meaningless καί in such cases.<sup>31</sup> The second is 753B (Murray, 99 line 1): προέλαβεν ἔν τινι τόπῳ δι' ἧς ἔμελλεν ὁ μοναχὸς διέρχεσθαι, where ἧς seems to refer to a masculine antecedent. In this case, the difficulty is explained by Luke 19:4–5: καὶ (Ζακχαῖος) προδραμὼν εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν, ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν (τὸν Ἰησοῦν), ὅτι ἐκείνης (v. l. δι' ἐκείνης) ἔμελλεν διέρχεσθαι. καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον...<sup>32</sup> Evidently, this passage served as a model for the passage in the *Vita*. It shows that ἧς does not refer to τόπῳ but to the way which the monk was going to pass. A third

<sup>27</sup> Cf. 749C (Murray, 94 line 1): ἐκεῖσε παραγενόμενος τῷ διορατικῷ τε χαρίσματι κοσμούμενος ἐθεάσατο; 752C (Murray, 96 line 11): ἀποκριθεὶς... καὶ φησιν.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. 756A (Murray, 100 line 12): ἔδυσ ὡς νύκτα καχέσπερος.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. 748C (Murray, 91 line 1): τὸν διάβολον... θυσίαν προσφέροντα; 749A (Murray, 92 line 5) εἶπεν αὐτόν ὁ δσος; 752D (Murray, 97 line 6): ὁ νομοθετῶν τοὺς νόμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων κρίνειν δίκαια; 756A (Murray, 100 line 6): θλίψις με... κατέστηκεν; 757A (Murray, 102 line 16): οἱ δουλεύοντες αὐτόν; 757B (Murray, 103 line 7): ἐντελοῦμαι τοῦτον.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. 752A (Murray, 95 line 3): μάτην παρεδρεύεις τῷ μοναχῷ καὶ φυλάττεις αὐτῷ; 756B (Murray, 101 line 12): οὕτως ἡρνήσω κόσμον καὶ τοῖς ἐν κόσμῳ.

<sup>31</sup> A case in point is 748C (Murray, 90 line 3): ἦν ὁ δσος παύλων ἐν τῷ τοῦ φόρου πλாகώματι καὶ ὡς ἔθως ἔχων ποτὲ μὲν τρέχειν ποτὲ δὲ σάσσειν, γενόμενος κατέναντι τῆς μεγάλης πύλης τοῦ σινάτου κατεσκόπει τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας λωρόποδας. Here, one would expect the καὶ to appear before γενόμενος rather than before ὡς ἔθως ἔχων.

<sup>32</sup> I owe this reference to Professor Jerker Blomqvist.

passage at 756B (Murray, 101 line 3) is perhaps more likely to be corrupt. It runs as follows: τί θέλεις σὺ τὸ χρυσίον, ὅπερ καὶ μετὰ θάνατόν σου οἷς οὐ θέλεις ἢ καὶ ἐχθροί σου τοῦτο κληρονομήσουσιν. Here, either a verb like ἔσται or ἐλεύσεται is missing before οἷς, or οἷς is subject of κληρονομήσουσιν as well as object of θέλεις, the dative being used in a rather loose way.<sup>33</sup> Although I cannot give a quite satisfactory explanation of this difficulty,<sup>33a</sup> it does not seem to me to be so serious as to require emendation. It is also remarkable that the author of the fragment has corrected himself in three other cases<sup>34</sup> but not in this. Did he not regard it as an error, or did it simply escape his notice? However that may be, it obviously carries far less weight than the fact that in all other respects the fragment corresponds to what one would expect of the autograph. Moreover, there would seem to be little point in assuming that the fragment is nothing more than a good copy of an uncial model. In the tenth century, uncial MSS were not copied in uncial hand but transliterated into minuscule. Why should a scribe stick to the uncial writing in this particular case? Because he wanted people to believe that the copy had been made before the introduction of minuscule script in the ninth century?<sup>35</sup> But whereas Nicephorus had good grounds for trying to deceive his contemporaries by pretending that he had discovered a hitherto unknown document, there was no reason why a copyist should try to repeat this trick. On the contrary, once "the old document" had been "discovered," the trick could hardly be repeated without harming the credibility of the *Vita*. For if there were more than one ancient-looking copy, people would naturally wonder why this interesting text had not been known before. For the mere multiplication of the *Vita*, on the other hand, the minuscule script must have appeared much better suited than the uncial.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> The MSS most closely related to the uncial fragment have εἰ instead of οἷς, but this does not solve the problem.

<sup>33a</sup> After this article was sent to the editor, I noticed a passage in the *Life of St. Philaretus*, version BHG<sup>3</sup>, 1512, which seems to explain the difficulty. St. Philaretus, being on his death bed, recommends to his offspring that they give away their riches to the poor and so lay up treasure for themselves in heaven. "Do not leave riches behind you when you die," he says, "ἵνα μὴ ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ὑμῖν ἀγαθοῖς τρυφήσουσιν ἄλλοτριοι· ἔστι πολλάκις καὶ οἷς οὐ θέλετε τοῦτον (= τὸν πλοῦτον) ἔσσει." (Ed. A. A. Vasiliev, IRAIK, 5 [1900], 81 lines 32–33). The parallel shows that Nicephorus has forgotten to insert the verb ἔσσει, or ἔσσεις, after οἷς οὐ θέλεις. As in the preceding case, the error evidently derives from a badly integrated literary borrowing. Vasiliev's edition is based on Parisinus gr. 1510, which was written in the tenth century. There are also other striking similarities between this revised version of the *Vita Philareti* and the version of our *Vita* that is most closely related to the uncial fragment. These similarities I hope to discuss elsewhere.

<sup>34</sup> Fol. IX, col. 1 (748A; Murray, 89 line 4): ἀλληγάλλως; fol. IV, col. 2 (749A; Murray, 92 line 9): βλέπεις; fol. VII, col. 1 (753C; Murray, 99 line 7): νενομισμένης. The author originally wrote ἀλληγάλλως, βλέπεις, and νενομισμένη.

<sup>35</sup> Sara Murray, who realized the importance of the uncial fragment, suggested that the reason for the uncial writing might be that the copyist "was a man who clung to ancient traditions of writing," or that he "had before him as his original a valuable manuscript, the archetypal of the text, the value of which he sought to make known to future readers by making his manuscript uncommon" (Murray, 120f.). She did not, however, make any serious effort to solve the problem which, in her opinion, was insoluble.

<sup>36</sup> I am consequently basing the edition of the *Vita* which I am preparing mainly on those MSS which are most closely related to the uncial fragment (cf. the references given in note 1). I do not agree with Maas, who in his review of Murray's study, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 317–19, argued that, on the whole, all the surviving MSS are equally good or bad.

However, in spite of the allusions to the reign of Leo I and the patriarchate of Epiphanius, the uncial MS, and the prophecies *ex eventu*, which automatically characterize Andreas as a man who lived long ago, the historical atmosphere of the *Vita* is rather thin. To begin with, although it is historically correct to speak of a fifth-century *salos*, it seems somewhat anachronistic to describe him as living in Constantinople. The *saloi* of the Early Byzantine period did not appear in the capital but in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, as Grosdidier de Matons' survey shows.<sup>37</sup> Nicephorus' credibility is further harmed by the fact that Andreas is not mentioned in the *Synaxaria* until 1301,<sup>38</sup> whereas Symeon Salos appears in the *Synaxarium* of Constantinople already in the ninth-tenth century,<sup>39</sup> as well as in the *Ecclesiastical History* by Evagrius,<sup>40</sup> written *ca.* 600, and in the *Life of Symeon Salos*,<sup>41</sup> written by Leontius of Neapolis in the middle of the seventh century. As for Epiphanius, he is no doubt a historical person, but Nicephorus' portrait of him is rather vague, and Nicephorus is also vague on the relation between Epiphanius and himself. He seems to be pretending that he is older than Andreas (cf. 637A, where he plays the role of Andreas' adviser), and consequently much older than Epiphanius. Yet, at the end of the *Vita*, he indicates that he did not write it until Epiphanius was dead (τοῦ γεγονότος ἐνθάδε ἀρχιερέως 888C). This would imply that the author was born before the middle of the fifth century and wrote the *Life of Andreas Salos* after 535, which is unlikely. Theognostus, the *protospatharios* and future general of the East mentioned at the beginning of the *Vita*,<sup>42</sup> does not even seem to be a historical figure. He is supposed to have been *magister militum per Orientem*, it would seem, but no *magister militum per Orientem* called Theognostus is recorded for the second half of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, Nicephorus seems to have read the *Life of Daniel Stylites*,<sup>44</sup> but he does not exploit very much of the material offered there to strengthen the historical atmosphere of his own work. He does not mention the successors of Leo I, under whom Andreas must have lived if he came to Constantinople in Leo's reign. Nor does he mention Gennadius I, who was bishop of Constantinople under Leo I. He does not mention the theater, or the chariot races in the Hippodrome, although these played such an important part in the life of common people during the early history of Constantinople. He also disregards the fact that St. Sophia in the fifth century was quite different from Justinian's magnificent building.

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 279 ff.

<sup>38</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, col. 713, line 53, cod. Mc, written 1301. The *Synaxarium Chiffletianum*, which contains a notice of Andreas Salos, was not written by Patriarch Sergius II (1001–19), as Murray thought (Murray, 31); it was compiled closer to the fourteenth century. See F. Halkin, "Distiques et notices propres au synaxaire de Chifflet," *AnalBoll*, 66 (1948), 5–32, esp. 5.

<sup>39</sup> *Synaxarium CP*, cols. 833 line 5–834 line 19.

<sup>40</sup> Ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier (London, 1898; repr. Amsterdam, 1964), 182 line 26–184 line 23.

<sup>41</sup> *BHG*<sup>3</sup>, 1677.

<sup>42</sup> Στρατηλάτης ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀνατολῆς (v. l. ἀνατολικοῖς) μέρεσιν (632A).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. R. Guiland, "Les termes désignant le commandant en chef des armées byzantines," *Επ. Έτ. Βυζ. Σπ.*, 29 (1959), 35–77; *idem*, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, I (Berlin, 1967), 385 ff.; A. Demandt, *RE*, Suppl. XII (1970), 790.

<sup>44</sup> *BHG*<sup>3</sup>, 489; cf. *supra*, p. 130.

Even in his imitation of a sixth-century MS (granted that I have understood the role of the uncial writing correctly) Nicephorus is rather careless. He accentuates the uncial script regularly, although an author of the sixth century would hardly have done so. He even puts in some double accents,<sup>45</sup> a feature that did not come into use until the ninth century.<sup>46</sup> The heading and the initial of chapter 32 on folio IV<sup>v</sup>, reproduced here, are of a type that seems to derive from early minuscule MSS. It is possible that Nicephorus succeeded in deceiving some of his contemporaries in this way, readers who were looking for other qualities than historical accuracy, but to the modern scholar the fake is obvious, as the datings of the manuscript catalogues show.

He also weakens the historical credibility by committing more serious anachronisms. That he speaks of Symeon Salos as a man of the past has already been mentioned. In the eschatological section, he has Andreas predict that Illyricum and Egypt will be restored to the Roman Empire (856A), as if these provinces had already been lost in the fifth century. He also seems to allude to Iconoclasm (837A). He mentions a *chartoularios plōimôn* (849B), although this office was not introduced until the ninth century.<sup>47</sup> He refers to the Virgin's chapel in the portico of the Forum of Constantine the Great (712B) and to the Myrelaion (721A), although these churches are not heard of before the reigns of Basil I (867–86) and Romanus I (920–44), respectively.<sup>48</sup> The Anemodoulion as the name of the weather vane of Theodosius I, and the topographical names Heptascalon (841D), *ta Maurianou* (832D), and Antiphorus (856B), do not appear in our sources before the middle of the tenth century.<sup>49</sup> None of them is likely to have been used in the fifth–sixth century. All these inconsistencies bring us to the question of the real date of the *Vita*.

## II. THE *Life of Andreas Salos* AND THE *Ekphrasis* OF CONSTANTINE OF RHODES

Among the references just mentioned, the church of Myrelaion gives the latest terminus post quem. It seems to have been built in the early twenties of the tenth century.<sup>50</sup> As far as we can see now, there are no open references to any later buildings, persons, institutions, or other circumstances. If we

<sup>45</sup> E.g., fol. IV<sup>v</sup>, col. 2, line 9; see photo.

<sup>46</sup> M. Reil, "Zur Akzentuation griechischer Handschriften," *BZ*, 19 (1910), 476–529, esp. 482f.

<sup>47</sup> Ahrweiler, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 13), 74. The man is introduced as εἰς τῶν μεγάλων. Nicephorus may be thinking of him as he would have appeared in the mid-tenth century, when the prestige of the imperial navy was at its height.

<sup>48</sup> Maas, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 318; R. Janin, "Notes d'histoire et de topographie," *REB*, 26 (1968), 171–84, esp. 178–84.

<sup>49</sup> The name Anemodoulion seems to appear for the very first time in the *Life of Andreas Salos*; cf. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* (*supra*, note 13), 100. The Antiphorus of Constantinople I have only found mentioned in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De caeremoniis*, Bonn ed. (1829), 165 line 17 (*Constantin Porphyrogénète, Le livre des cérémonies*, ed. A. Vogt, I [Paris, 1935; repr. 1967], 154 line 3); there was, however, an *antiphorus* also at Edessa (Procopius, *De aedificiis* II.7.6) and at Antioch (Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History* III.28; Malalas, Bonn ed. [1831], 397 line 23). For Heptascalon, see Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 229; for *ta Maurianou*, *idem*, "Etudes de topographie byzantine: Ἐμβολοὶ τοῦ Δομνίου, τὰ Μαυριανοῦ," *EO*, 36 (1937), 129–56.

<sup>50</sup> Janin, "Notes d'histoire."

want to go further, we must therefore turn to other, dated, literary works to see if they offer any clues. Even if the *Life of Andreas Salos* is a literary forgery, it is reasonable to think that Nicephorus' choice of historical material as well as his handling of this material reflect the outlook and predilections of his contemporaries. Thus there seems to be a certain affinity between the selection of buildings and works of art mentioned in the *Vita* and the Early Byzantine wonders described in the *Ekphrasis* of Constantine of Rhodes,<sup>51</sup> written sometime between 931 and 944.<sup>52</sup>

Constantine's poem consists of 981 iambic trimeters. The first half is mainly devoted to a description of the seven θαύματα of Constantinople, forming a kind of prologue to the main theme of the poem, the *ekphrasis* of the church of the Holy Apostles. According to the poet, the seven wonders of Constantinople were the column of Justinian I, the column of Constantine the Great, the Senate House at the Forum, a cross-bearing column of uncertain identity, a monumental weather vane erected by Theodosius I, the column of Theodosius I, and the column of Arcadius. As in the case of the seven wonders of the world, the seven wonders of Constantinople varied with the interests of the authors. In the *Parastaseis*,<sup>53</sup> compiled in the middle of the eighth century, there is a set of wonders of Constantinople quite different than in Constantine's *Ekphrasis*.<sup>54</sup> The monuments described as wonders in the *Parastaseis* do not appear in the *Life of Andreas Salos*. There is, however, a certain correspondence between the topographical setting of the *Vita* and the wonders of the *Ekphrasis*. Of the six monuments that fit the chronological frame of the *Vita* (the column of Justinian would have been anachronistic, except in a prophecy *ex eventu*), three are mentioned; namely, the column of Constantine the Great (837C, 868B), the Senate House at the Forum (748C), and the weather vane of Theodosius I (749A). The second of these is particularly interesting. It is mentioned in the following context. Andreas was standing in the Forum contemplating the λωρόποδες, represented on the great door of the Senate House, when a passerby slapped him on his back and said: "You imbecile, what are you looking at?" Andreas, knowing that the man was a great sinner, answered: "You fool! I am looking at the visible idols, but you are a spiritual λωρόπους, and a serpent, and of the viper's brood. Your soul's axles and your heart's spiritual legs are twisted and going to hell. Hell has opened its mouth to devour you, for you are a fornicator and an adulterer and you sacrifice to the devil every day."<sup>55</sup> In the poem of Constantine of Rhodes a considerable

<sup>51</sup> Ed. E. Legrand, "Description des œuvres d'art et de l'église des Saints Apôtres de Constantinople. Poème en vers iambiques par Constantin le Rhodien," *REG*, 9 (1896), 32-65; with archeological commentary by Th. Reinach, *ibid.*, 66-103.

<sup>52</sup> Reinach, *op. cit.*, 67; G. Downey, "Constantine the Rhodian: His Life and Writings," in *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), 212-21, esp. 214.

<sup>53</sup> Ed. Preger (*supra*, note 20), 39-51.

<sup>54</sup> As pointed out by Reinach, *op. cit.*, 69 note 2.

<sup>55</sup> . . . γενόμενος κατέναντι τῆς μεγάλης πύλης τοῦ Σινάτου κατεσκόπει τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας λωρόποδας. Εἰς δὲ τῶν διερχομένων ἰδὼν τὸν ὄσιον τοῦτοις ἐντρανίζοντα δίδωσιν αὐτῷ κόσσον κατὰ τοῦ αὐχένος λέγων· "Σαλὲ, τί ἴστασαι βλέπων;" Ὁ δὲ μακάριος ἔφη πρὸς αὐτόν· "Ἐξηχε τῷ νοί, τῶν εἰδώλων τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ἐντρανίζων ἔστηκα. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς νοητὸς λωρόπους καθέστηκας καὶ ὄφης καὶ γέννημα ἐχιδνῶν· οἱ γὰρ

portion of the section on the Senate House (vv. 90–162) is devoted to a description of the great bronze door (vv. 125–52). The poet says that it was Constantine the Great who brought it to Constantinople from the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, where it had been in use ὅτ' ἦν ἱερόφωσις εἰδώλων πλάνης (v. 129). The door was decorated with a Gigantomachy in relief in which you could see Zeus with his thunderbolts, Poseidon with his trident, Apollo with his bow, and Hercules in his lion's skin:

καὶ τοὺς Γίγαντας ὥς δράκοντας τοὺς πόδας  
κάτωθεν ἐνστρέφοντας ἐσπειρημένους,  
ρίπτοῦντας ὕψει τῶν πετρῶν ἀποσπάδας (vv. 139–41).

It appears from these lines that the legs of the giants ended as snakes, which was the usual way of representing the giants in postclassical art.<sup>56</sup> The expression λωρόπους ("with legs that are like thongs" or "whips"), which appears in the *Life of Andreas Salos*, is an obvious reference to the snake-like legs of the giants.<sup>57</sup> Andreas likens the sinful man to a snake-legged giant who fights against God but is bound to lose.

It is worth noting that Nicephorus alludes to the Gigantomachy a second time at 864D, where he says that the wicked apocalyptic woman will try to fight with God, εἰς ὕψος ἐμπτύουσα καὶ λίθους πέμπουσα. The last words are clearly reminiscent of the last of the lines just quoted from Constantine's poem. I find it hard to believe that a man like Nicephorus, who evidently had a deep dislike for the "exterior" learning and secular art, was so familiar with the history and meaning of the Gigantomachy represented in relief on the bronze door of the Senate House that he could use it directly as a source for the *Life of Andreas Salos*.<sup>58</sup> It seems much more likely that he got his information from a literary source; not, however, from Themistius,<sup>59</sup> or from a mythological handbook,<sup>60</sup> or a learned *ekphrasis* of ancient art, written by an erudite humanist (this kind of *ekphrasis* did not appear between the reign of Justinian

ἄξονες τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ τὰ νοητὰ διαβήματα τῆς καρδίας σου διεστραμμένα εἰσὶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄδην βαδίζοντα· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἔχανεν ὁ ἄδης καὶ καταπιεῖν σε ἐκδέχεται πορνεύοντα καὶ μοιχεύοντα καὶ τὸν διάβολον καὶ ἑκάστην θυσίαν προσφέροντα." (Text of the uncial fragment, which covers this passage.)

<sup>56</sup> According to Cedrenus, Bonn ed. (1838), 565, the door had been given to the Artemision by Trajan.

<sup>57</sup> As Murray, 29, rightly suggests.

<sup>58</sup> On the Gigantomachy in the miniatures, see K. Weitzmann, "The Survival of Mythological Representations in Early Christian and Byzantine Art and Their Impact on Christian Iconography," *DOP*, 14 (1960), 43–68, esp. 50: "Only within a circle of erudite Byzantine humanists who moved in the atmosphere of the patriarchal and imperial palaces were miniatures like the Gigantomachy produced and fully appreciated. [...] as soon as they had lost their physical association with the explanatory text, their proper meaning was quickly lost [...]."

<sup>59</sup> *Themistii Orationes*, ed. W. Dindorf (Leipzig, 1832), Or. XIII, 176D: "Ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ἄστει τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου τῆς μάχης τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν γιγάντων εἰκὼν ἐν χαλκῷ πεποιημένη ἀντὶ κρηπίδος τοῦ βουλευτηρίου. ἐν οὗν τῇ εἰκόνι ταύτῃ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς οἱ γίγαντες ἀνταίρουσι καὶ ἐξορῶσιν οἱ μὲν πέτρας, οἱ δὲ δρυὲς κτλ. (= *Themistii orationes quae supersunt*, ed. G. Downey, I [Leipzig, 1951], 253 lines 7–11). A little later in the same text, the giants are called dragons, which obviously alludes to their snake-formed legs. Thus, Themistius offers the basic material. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that this source was known to Nicephorus. He was certainly not the man to study the works of pagan rhetoricians.

<sup>60</sup> In the Middle Byzantine period, Byzantine scholars seem to have been familiar with Apollodorus' *Bibliothékē*; see K. Weitzmann, *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art* (Princeton, 1951), 83.

and the middle of the twelfth century<sup>61</sup>), but from a literary work like Constantine's poem, which deals with monuments sponsored by Christian emperors and excludes pagan art, except when it had been adopted by a Christian emperor and was given a Christian reinterpretation. The buildings and monuments which Constantine of Rhodes describes all belong to the Early Byzantine period. If the *Ekphrasis* was written before the *Vita*, it may have attracted the attention of Nicephorus, who needed material for the historical setting of the *Vita*. It seems significant that Constantine mentions the fire that blackened the Senate House:

ὅταν Λέων κατήρχεν ὁ πρώην ἀναξ,  
Λέων ἐκεῖνος τῆς Βηρίνης εὐνέτης (vv. 108–9)

The fact that Leo I was mentioned in connection with the Senate House may have helped to attract Nicephorus' attention.

The weather vane of Theodosius I is described by Constantine (vv. 178–201). It had the shape of a female figure and was placed on top of a high pyramid, the four sides of which were decorated with reliefs representing naked Erotes playing in a rural and pastoral landscape; boys with trumpets symbolized the four winds. According to the *Patria*,<sup>62</sup> compiled at the end of the tenth century, the monument had been erected by Leo III (717–41), but the character of the decoration shows that the attribution to Theodosius I (379–95) is much more likely.<sup>63</sup> Nicephorus obviously believed that it existed in the reign of Leo I. He calls it τὸ Ἀνεμοδούλιον (749A; Murray, 92 line 3), a name that Constantine does not use, perhaps because it did not fit the iambic trimeter (although Constantine is not strict on this point), or because he found it too folkloristic. There is no reason to doubt that Nicephorus has in mind the same monument as Constantine. First, Nicetas Choniates uses the name Anemodoulion of the same monument.<sup>64</sup> Second, Cedrenus, whose description of the monument is based on the poem of Constantine of Rhodes, speaks of it as τὸ τετρασκελὲς τέχνασμα ὃ δῆριν λέγουσιν ἀνέμων, i.e., "the battle of the winds."<sup>65</sup> The δῆρις ἀνέμων seems to be a paraphrase of the dissimilated form Ἀνεμοδοῦριν,<sup>66</sup> which appears in the MSS of the *Life of Andreas Salos* as well as in the *Patria*. Third, the context fits the description in Constantine's *Ekphrasis* perfectly. Andreas came to the part of the Forum where women are selling "those costly feminine embellishments" (τὸν πολυτελῆ κόσμον ἐκείνον). He looked at the wares and exclaimed: "Oh! Chaff and dust!"<sup>67</sup> As he stood contem-

<sup>61</sup> C. Mango, "Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder," *DOP*, 17 (1963), 53–75, esp. 67.

<sup>62</sup> Ed. Preger (*supra*, note 20), 253.

<sup>63</sup> Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire* (*supra*, note 14), 44 note 114.

<sup>64</sup> *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. I. A. van Dieten, CFHB, XI,1 (Berlin, 1975), 332 line 35, 648 line 56.

<sup>65</sup> Bonn ed. (1838), 565 line 20.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. St. B. Psaltes, *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1974), § 156. J. Compennass, in *RQ*, 22 (1908), 55ff., suggests that the original form of the name was ἀνεμοειδωλεῖον, which through ἀνεμο-μοδουλεῖον became Ἀνεμοδούλιον, but this etymology seems too complicated to be likely.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. LXX, Job 21:18.



plating all the buying and selling that took place in the Forum, an old man passed by and said: "You fool! Why do you shout chaff and phantoms? If you are selling chaff, go to the Anemodoulion and sell it there!" The man's suggestion is a joke. Chaff is associated with winds: if you are selling chaff, the appropriate place to do it is by the weather vane.<sup>68</sup>

Also, the second and main part of the poem, the *ekphrasis* of the church of the Holy Apostles, is reminiscent of the *Life of Andreas Salos*. Constantine of Rhodes says that the church of the Holy Apostles had not always been so large and splendid as it was in his time. The original church, built on the fourth and largest of Constantinople's seven hills, had been rather small:

Ἄλλ' οὖν κατ' ἀρχὰς οὐ τόσος μορφὴν πέλεν (v. 472)

...

ἀλλὰ μικράν πως τὴν κατάστασιν φέρων,  
Κωνσταντίνου<sup>69</sup> τὸ πρῶτον ἐκ Θεσπισμάτων  
λαβόντος ἀρχὴν τοῦδε παγκλύτου δόμου... (vv. 476–78).

However, Justinian I tore down the old church and erected a completely new building. Justinian's church is very large:

εὐρύς γάρ ἐστιν, εὐροσύνθετος λίαν (v. 461).

It is like a heaven with five stars, forming a cross:

ὥσπερ τις ἄλλος ἀστροσύνθετος πόλος,  
πενταστρόμορφος, συγκροτούμενος κάραις  
τρισι μὲν ὀρθαῖς, ταῖς δυσι δ' ἐγκαρσῖαις (vv. 457–59),

or like a cover that protects the whole city with its five domes:

πεντάστεγός τις σφαιροσύνθετος σκέπη  
πᾶσαν περικλείουσα τῷ δοκεῖν πόλιν (vv. 503–4).

The architect made the central dome bigger than the others, for it was destined to be the throne of the Lord and to protect his image:

μέλλουσιν εἶναι δεσπότου μέγαν θρόνον  
τῆς εἰκόνος τε τῆς ὑπερτίμου σκέπην  
τῆς ἐγγραφείσης ἐν μέσῳ κλεινοῦ δόμου (vv. 628–30).

It is remarkable that Nicephorus does not mention Justinian's reconstruction of St. Sophia, although he introduces himself as a priest of this church. Instead he, like Constantine of Rhodes, dwells upon the history of the Holy Apostles. One night, he says, Andreas got stuck in a hole in the ground near

<sup>68</sup> Compennass, *loc. cit.*, thinks that the Anemodoulion was "ein freier Platz, auf welchem Marktwaren feilgeboten werden durften," which was named after the monument. But you cannot sell chaff and dust on the market.

<sup>69</sup> The unique MS has Κωνσταντίνου; see G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople. A Contribution to the Criticism of the *Vita Constantini* Attributed to Eusebius," *DOP*, 6 (1951), 53–80, esp. 55 note 8 and fig. 13. On this point, Nicephorus follows another tradition than Constantine of Rhodes. According to him, "οἱ τῆς πόλεως" said that the original chapel had been built by Constantine the Great.

a chapel belonging to the Apostles Peter and Paul. Andreas prayed to the Apostles for help. At once there appeared from the chapel a shining cross and two beautiful men, presumably Peter and Paul, who helped him out of the pit. The Apostles disappeared again, but the shining cross remained and showed the way to the portico. Then it rose above the middle of the city, as if lifted by golden wings. When he could no longer see it, he discovered that the chapel of the archapostles had become a large and splendid five-domed church. He also saw the Lord sitting on a throne in the middle of the church, surrounded by Cherubim and Seraphim and the whole host of the heavenly powers. According to this vision Andreas predicted the rebuilding of the church, saying: "As time goes on, a pious emperor will rebuild it the way I saw it."<sup>70</sup>

Janin<sup>71</sup> does not think that Nicephorus had the Holy Apostles in mind, remarking that this church was not dedicated to Peter and Paul alone and that it had never been a mere εὐκτήριον. These objections, however, would not seem to be decisive. With regard to the first difficulty, Grosdidier de Matons<sup>72</sup> points out that a tendency to let Peter and Paul represent all twelve apostles appears in other sources as well. The second difficulty is easily explained if we remember that Constantine of Rhodes says that the original church was μικράν πως τὴν κατάστασιν φέρων. The identification is also supported by the fact that Nicephorus says that the cross rose κατὰ τὸ μέσον τῆς πόλεως, which suggests the site of the Holy Apostles. I think the correspondences between the two texts indicate that the *Life of Andreas Salos* was written after the *Ekphrasis*, i.e., after 931, even if it is hard to know for certain that Nicephorus had actually seen Constantine's poem. In any case, it is not usual for hagiographers to be ahead of their time.

### III. THE *Life of Andreas Salos* AND THE *Vita Basilii*

In certain respects, the *Life of Andreas Salos* is reminiscent of the *Vita Basilii*, Constantine Porphyrogenitus' famous biography of his grandfather Basil I (867–86).<sup>73</sup> According to Constantine, Basil belonged to a family of Armenian Arsacids who had come to Byzantium in the reign of Leo I.<sup>74</sup> The

<sup>70</sup> In the MSS most closely related to the uncial fragment, the relevant passage reads as follows: ...συνέβη εὐρεθῆναι αὐτὸν πλησίον εὐκτηρίου τινὸς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ κορυφαίων ἀποστόλων Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, ὅπερ ἔφασκον οἱ τῆς πόλεως τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν βασιλέα οἰκοδομῆσαι... εἶδε καὶ ἰδοῦ· [the cross] καθάπερ πτέρυξι διαχρύσοις εἰς τὸ ὕψος ἦρθη κατὰ τὸ μέσον τῆς πόλεως... ἰδοῦ, τὸ εὐκτήριον ἐκεῖνο τῶν κορυφαίων ἀποστόλων νεύσει Θεοῦ μετασκευασθὲν πεντακόρυφος ναὸς ἐγεγόνει περικαλλῆς τε τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ εἶδει ἀμίμητος. Εἶδε δὲ τὸν κύριον ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐπὶ θρόνου καθήμενον καὶ Χερουβὶμ καὶ Σεραφίμ κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ σὺν πάσῃ τῇ στρατιᾷ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δυνάμεων φόβῳ καὶ τρόμῳ παριστάμενα... Κατὰ τὴν ὥραν οὗν ἐκείνην προεῖπε τοῦ ναοῦ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον βελτίωσιν, φήσας ὅτι "Καὶρῷ προβάνοντι ἀναστήσει αὐτὸν εὐσεβῆς βασιλεία καὶ ὃν τρόπον ἐθεασάμην αὐτόν" (740B–741B).

<sup>71</sup> *Eglises* (*supra*, note 16), 415.

<sup>72</sup> *Op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 307 note 104.

<sup>73</sup> *Vita Basilii* constitutes Book V of Theophanes Continuatus, Bonn ed. (1838), 211–353. For the much discussed question whether Basil was Constantine's real grandfather, see C. Mango, "Eudocia Ingerina, the Normans, and the Macedonian Dynasty," *ZVI*, 14/15 (1973), 17–27.

<sup>74</sup> *Vita Basilii*, 213 lines 9–10: Λέων ἦν ὁ μέγας τηνικαῦτα τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διέπων ἀρχήν, ὁ Ζήνωνος πενθερός.

Arsacids were well received at Constantinople, but, for political reasons, Leo moved them to Nike in Thrace. In the reign of Heraclius (610–41) they settled definitely at Adrianople in Thrace, the future capital of the Macedonian theme. Here Basil was born at the beginning of the ninth century, to judge from the internal chronology of the *Vita Basilii*. His mother, who was a Macedonian, claimed to be a descendant of Alexander the Great on her father's side and of Constantine the Great on her mother's. Thus, royal blood from East and West combined in Basil's person. In 813 Adrianople was taken by Krum. The captives, among them Basil and his parents, were deported to the Bulgarian territory north of the Danube. When peace was made in 815 they returned to Adrianople. After his father's death Basil, now a young man, ἄρας ἐκ Μακεδονίας τῆς Θράκης (223 line 5), went to Constantinople to try his luck. There a certain Theophilus, a distinguished man related to Michael III and Caesar Bardas, liked to surround himself with strong, fine looking, and beautifully dressed young men, apparently to compensate for his unimpressive stature (he was nicknamed Θεοφιλίτης, Θεοφιλίδιον, Θεοφιλίσκος, and described as ὁ μικρὸς ἐκεῖνος Θεόφιλος). Basil joined this circle, and Theophilus, who found him stronger and braver than all the others, soon made him his πρωτοστράτωρ. One day Antigonos, the son of Caesar Bardas, gave a dinner for Bardas, Theophilus, and a number of other important persons. Bardas was accompanied by some Bulgarians who were bragging that they had among them a wrestler who had never been beaten in a fight. Theophilus suggested a wrestling match between the Bulgarian and Basil. The fight had hardly begun before it ended. Basil lifted the Bulgarian as easily as a hay bundle and flung him on the table. Then Basil was noticed by Michael III who made him *his* πρωτοστράτωρ.<sup>75</sup> When Basil eventually became coemperor of the Byzantine Empire (866), a 350-year-old prophecy came true, for about the time when Basil's ancestors left Armenia, Isaac, an Armenian priest who was himself of Arsacid blood, had predicted that after 350 years a descendant of Arsakes would ascend the Roman throne.<sup>76</sup> The Romans were happy, for now they had obtained exactly what they had been praying for: an emperor who came from a poor family and knew the distress of the humble.<sup>77</sup> Emperor Basil is depicted as an ideal ruler. He studies the *Lives* of great men, saints as well

<sup>75</sup> Basil's career in Constantinople shows that he cannot have been born as early as Constantine Porphyrogenitus suggests.

<sup>76</sup> *Vita Basilii*, 241 lines 17 ff.: τότε δὲ καὶ ἡ πρὸ πεντήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἐτῶν πρόρρησις καὶ προφητεία τὸ τέλος ἐλάβανεν Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ διορατικωτάτου τῶν ἱερέων καὶ μοναχῶν, ὃς ἐξ Ἀρσακιδῶν καὶ αὐτὸς καταγόμενος δι' ὀράματος ἔμαθεν ὅτι μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον τὸν μεταξὺ ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἀρσακοῦ μέλλει τις ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς βασιλείας σκῆπτρα ἀναβιβᾶσθαι.

<sup>77</sup> *Vita Basilii*, 242 lines 3–6: πάντες γὰρ ἐπιστῆναι τοῖς πράγμασιν ἤρχοντο ἄνδρα καὶ τῆς ἐλάττονος τύχης πείραν δεξάμενον καὶ ἐγνωκότα τοὺς κατὰ τῶν πενήτων ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπερεχόντων κονδυλισμούς καὶ τὰς ἀδίκους ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀφαιρέσεις κτλ. In a mosaic in the Καινούργιον, a church erected by Basil, his children were shown saying: εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, λόγε τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐκ πτωχείας Δαυϊτικῆς ἀνύψωσας τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν (*ibid.*, 335 lines 2–3). Cf. also Liudprand, *Antapodosis* I.8: *Basiliius imperator augustus, avus huius* (i.e., of Constantine Porphyrogenitus), *Macedonia humili fuerat prosapia oriundus, descenditque Constantinopolin* τῆς πτωχείας, *tis ptochias, quod est paupertatis iugo etc.* (Freiherr vom Stein-Gedächtnis-Ausgabe. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, ed. R. Buchner and F.-J. Schmale, VIII [Darmstadt, 1971], 254).

as generals and emperors, and endeavors to imitate them.<sup>78</sup> He is generous, just, and pious. He converts Jews<sup>79</sup> and Russians<sup>80</sup> to Christianity and sends bishops and an archbishop to the Bulgarians, and, thanks to them and the work of the monks, the Bulgarians are definitely Christianized.<sup>81</sup> New churches are built, and the old ones are repaired.<sup>82</sup> Hitherto unknown treasures appear from under the surface of the earth.<sup>83</sup> The enemies of the Empire are defeated. Among his generals is a certain Andreas from Scythia, Ἀνδρέας ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐκ Σκυθῶν, described as clever, pious, and orthodox, although the emperor does not appreciate his ability as much as it deserves.<sup>84</sup>

It seems to me that Nicephorus was familiar with the *Vita Basilii* and borrowed from it in at least two different ways. First, Andreas' career is, *mutatis mutandis*, a copy of that of Basil. Nicephorus says that in the reign of Leo I there was at Constantinople a certain *protospatharios* Theognostus. This man had many οἰκέτας, and later he bought others still. Among the new boys there was a handsome Scythian called Andreas. This boy soon became Theognostus' favorite. He learned reading and writing and rose to be a secretary. His master heaped gifts upon him and dressed him in fine clothes from his own wardrobe. But Andreas was more interested in the *Passions* of the martyrs and the *Lives* of the saints than in the matters of this world. He dreamed of imitating the holy men, and eventually he decided to become a *salos*. He made this decision under the influence of a vision in which he found himself defeating an Ethiopian wrestler who had never been beaten before. The Ethiopian of course represents the Devil, but he also corresponds to the Bulgarian wrestler in the *Vita Basilii*. At last Andreas left his mortal master and became a servant of Christ.<sup>85</sup>

As I have already remarked,<sup>86</sup> Theognostus does not seem to be a historical person. Instead, there is reason to believe that he is a fictitious figure, made on the model of Theophilus ὁ Μικρός in the *Vita Basilii*. He may even have received the first half of his name from this person. That Andreas is said to be a Scythian, i.e., a barbarian from the North, corresponds, on a lower social level, to what Constantine Porphyrogenitus says of Basil: namely, that he was brought up in Macedonia and spent part of his childhood in Bulgarian captivity. As Nicephorus had created Andreas himself, he could give him any name he liked. I would think that he first conceived him as a Scythian, and then looked for a suitable name. St. Andreas was the apostle of the Scythians.

<sup>78</sup> *Vita Basilii*, 314 line 6ff.; cf. P. J. Alexander, "Secular Biography at Byzantium," *Speculum*, 15 (1940), 194–209.

<sup>79</sup> *Vita Basilii*, 341 line 8–342 line 6.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 342 line 20–343 line 2: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῶν Ῥῶς ἔθνους δυσμαχώτατόν τε καὶ ἀθεώτατον ὃν χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ σιρικών περιβλημάτων ἱκαναῖς ἐπιδόσεσιν εἰς συμβάσεις ἐφελκυσάμενος, καὶ σπονδὰς πρὸς αὐτοὺς σπεισάμενος εἰρηνικὰς, ἐν μετοχῇ γενέσθαι καὶ τοῦ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος ἔπεισε καὶ ἀρχιεπίσκοπον παρὰ τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰγνατίου τὴν χειροτονίαν δεξάμενον δέξασθαι παρεσκεύασεν κτλ.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 342 lines 7–19.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 321 line 17ff.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 256 line 23–257 line 1.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 284 line 9ff.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. 629Dff.

<sup>86</sup> *Supra*, p. 135.

Andreas was also the name of the able Scythian general mentioned in the *Vita Basilii*. So he naturally called him Andreas.

Second, Andreas' prophecy of the last reigns of the Roman Empire is in part parallel to Isaac's prophecy as mentioned in the *Vita Basilii*. Isaac's prophecy was made, it is said, 350 years before Basil's elevation, i.e., at the beginning of the sixth century.<sup>87</sup> This fits the internal chronology of the *Life of Andreas Salos*. Nicephorus says that Andreas came to Constantinople as a boy in the reign of Leo I (457–74) and that he lived for sixty-six years (888C), and he makes him prophesy on the end of the world toward the end of the *Vita*, i.e., we may conclude, at roughly the same time as Isaac is said to have predicted Basil's accession to the Roman throne. Moreover, Andreas' prophecy begins with the description of an emperor that is similar to the portrait of Basil I in the *Vita Basilii*. Like Basil, this emperor will rise from poverty;<sup>88</sup> in his days "all gold, wherever it is hidden, will be revealed before his majesty at the instigation of God";<sup>89</sup> he will "tame the fair-haired peoples"<sup>90</sup> and persecute the Jews;<sup>91</sup> he will "raise up holy churches and rebuild destroyed altars";<sup>92</sup> and he will make righteousness, moderation, and orthodoxy prevail. In short, he will restore Church and Empire to their former splendor. Like Basil in the *Vita Basilii*, he is a portrait of the ideal Christian emperor.

Parts of this material may also be found in other sources. Of Isaac's vision there was a Greek as well as an Armenian version. Actually, it was a forgery from the latter half of the ninth century, made, it would seem, to support Byzantine interests in Armenia, and perhaps also to strengthen the legitimacy of the Macedonian dynasty.<sup>93</sup> In the *Vita Ignatii*,<sup>94</sup> Photius is said to have invented a similar prophecy and to have smuggled it into the palace library.<sup>95</sup> The prophecy predicted that, after a certain number of generations, the Roman throne would be occupied by an offspring of Tiridates the Great, who was king of Armenia at the time of St. Gregory the Illuminator. That this offspring should be identified with Basil I was clearly indicated in the prophecy, as Photius, according to the *Vita Ignatii*, could demonstrate. In this way Photius is supposed to have ingratiated himself with the emperor and prepared his return to the patriarchate.<sup>96</sup> Obviously, Isaac's vision and Photius' forgery are closely related to each other, although it is not quite clear whether Photius

<sup>87</sup> Actually, Isaac, or Sahak, the last Arsacid patriarch of Armenia, to whom the prophecy was ascribed, died in 439.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. 853B: 'Εν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς βασιλεὺς ἀπὸ πενίας.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. 856B: 'Εν τοῖς καιροῖς γὰρ ἐκείνοις πᾶς χρυσὸς ὅς ἐστιν ἐν οἰκωδῆποτε τόπῳ κρυπτόμενος νεύσει θεοῦ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. 856A: ἡμερώσει τὰ ξανθὰ γένη.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. 856B: τοὺς Ἰουδαίους καταδιώξει.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. 856B: ἀναστήσει ναοὺς ἁγίους καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσει συντετριμμένα θυσιαστήρια.

<sup>93</sup> P. Garabed Der Sahaghian, "Un document arménien de la généalogie de Basile I<sup>er</sup>," *BZ*, 20 (1911), 165–76; N. Adontz, "L'âge et l'origine de l'empereur Basil I (867–886)," *Byzantion*, 8 (1933), 475–500; *ibid.*, 9 (1934), 223–60.

<sup>94</sup> The *Vita Ignatii* was probably written between 907 and 910; see R. J. H. Jenkins, "A Note on Nicetas David Paphlago and the *Vita Ignatii*," *DOP*, 19 (1965), 241–47.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 132.

<sup>96</sup> PG, 105, cols. 565C–568B.

ταῖς ῥικῶς. ἀρομαί  
ωστῶν ἐκείαν  
χωρὶς ἐκείαν  
τῶστα βρῖω παρ  
γενετοῖς· περὶ τοῦ  
ΛΒ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΕΝ  
ΤῶΣΤΑ ΒΡῖΩ·  
ΝΟΣΩΟΥΝ ΤΟΙΣ  
ΚΕΙΣ ΕΠΕΣΤΗ· ΕΥ  
ΡΕΝ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΝ ΤΙ  
ΝΑ ΕΝΕΥΛΑΒΕΙ  
ΠΕΥΦΗΜΙΖΟΜΕΝΟ  
ΜΕΘΙΤΕΡΟΥ ΤΙΝΟΣ  
ΚΑΙ ΩΣ ΔΗΘΕΝ ΠΕΡΙ  
ΩΦΕΛΕΙΑΣ Τῶ ΧΗΣ  
ΛΟΓΟΝ ΚΙΝΟΥΝ  
ΤΑΣ· ΕΠΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΣ  
ΓΑΡ ΠΙΤΗ ΒΙΩΣΗ  
ΑΥΤΟΥ· ΕΥΛΑΒΗΣ  
ΥΠΗΡΧΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΥ  
ΣΕΒΗΣ· ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΡ  
ΓΑΖΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΑ  
ΤΟΙΣ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΙΣ ΕΥ  
ΑΡΜΟΣΤΑ· ΕΝ ΤΟΥ  
ΤΟΙΣ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΣΦΑΛ  
ΛΟΜΕΝΟΣ· ΦΙΛΩ  
ΛΟΣ ΟΝ· ΤΙΝΕΣ ΔΙ  
ΤῶΝ ΠΟΛΙΤῶΝ

ΕΞΑΓΟΡΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ  
ΤΑΣ ΛΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΣ ΑΥ  
ΤῶΝ· ΠΑΡΕΙΧΟΝ  
ΑΥΤῶ ΙΚΑΝΗΝ  
ΧΡΥΣΙΟΥ ΠΟΣΟΤΗ  
ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΔΑΔΝΕΙΜΕ  
ΤΟΙΣ ΠΕΝΗΣΙΝ· Υ  
ΠΕΡ ΥΥΧΙΚΗΣ ΡΙΑΣ  
ΑΥΤῶΝ· ΟΔΕ Τῶ  
ΠΑΤΗΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΑΡ  
ΓΥΡΙΑΣΗ ΤΤΟΜΕ  
ΝΟΣ· ΟΥΔΕ ΝΕΖΑΥ  
ΤῶΝ ΠΑΡΕΙΧΙΝ  
ΤΙΝΙ· ΑΛΛΑ ΠΑΝ  
ΤΑΣ ΤΟΝΙΚΟΡΒΑ  
ΝΑΝΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΥΜΕ  
ΤΟ· ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΩΣ Η  
ΩΣ ΑΤΕ Τῶ ΒΙΩ  
ΖΩΝ ΟΥΤῶ ΧΩ  
ΟΥΤΩ ΤΗ ΦΙΛΑΡΓΥ  
ΡΙΑ ΛΑΜΙΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ  
ΚΑΙ ΒΛΕΠΟΝΕΑΥ  
ΤΟΝ ΠΑΛΗΘΥΝΟ  
ΜΕΝΟΝ· Η ΓΑΛΛΕ  
ΤΟ· ΟΟΥΝ ΜΑΔΙΣ  
ΟΣΑΝ ΔΡΙΑΣ ΕΚΕΙΣ  
ΠΑΡΑΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ·  
Τῶ ΔΙΩΡΑΤΙΚῶ



should be regarded as the original author or not.<sup>97</sup> However that may be, nothing indicates that Nicephorus had seen these forged documents with his own eyes, although he probably knew the *Vita Ignatii*.<sup>98</sup> Much related material is also contained in the funeral oration on Basil delivered by Leo VI in 886 or 887.<sup>99</sup> Like Constantine, Leo says that Basil was an Arsacid, that he came from a poor family, that he rejuvenated the Empire<sup>100</sup> and defeated and punished the Arabs,<sup>101</sup> that he ordered buildings to be erected and embellished,<sup>102</sup> and that in Basil's reign the Golden Age seemed to have reappeared.<sup>103</sup> On the other hand, Leo does not mention the vision of Isaac, nor does he mention Theophiltzes or Basil's fight with the Bulgarian. These elements Nicephorus cannot have obtained from Leo's funeral speech. Nor does Nicephorus seem to be relying on the section dealing with Basil I in Genesius' history.<sup>104</sup> There, too, important details, such as Isaac's vision, are missing, although Genesius offers more of the legendary and narrative material than Leo does. The *Vita Basilii* seems to be the only single text that contains all the relevant material. It is therefore more likely than any other text to have been Nicephorus' source for Andreas' date and background. It is also very likely to have influenced the description of the first eschatological ruler.

The *Vita Basilii* was written ca. 950.<sup>105</sup> Thus, there is reason to advance the terminus post quem for the composition of the *Life of Andreas Salos* to the middle of the tenth century.

#### IV. EPIPHANIUS

After Andreas, the most important person in the *Vita* is Epiphanius. Nicephorus no doubt had in mind the man who was bishop of Constantinople from 520 to 535.<sup>106</sup> To the modern historian, Bishop Epiphanius appears as a rather shadowy figure. Nothing is known of his family. According to Theophanes he was presbyter and syncellus in the Church of Constantinople before he became the successor of John II.<sup>107</sup> He seems to have been "a quiet,

<sup>97</sup> Garabed Der Sahaghian, *op. cit.*, 175, points out that, if his dating of the vision to the patriarchate of Basil's son, Stephen I (886–93), is correct, the vision is hostile to Photius.

<sup>98</sup> If Nicephorus used uncials in order to give the autograph an ancient look, this was a forgery of the same kind as the one described in the *Vita Ignatii*; cf. *supra*, p. 132.

<sup>99</sup> *Oraison Funèbre de Basil I par son fils Léon VI le Sage*, ed. A. Vogt and I. Hausherr, *OC*, 26,1 (Rome, 1932).

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 56 lines 10–15: οἷόν τι γῆρας ἀτερπὲς τὸ σχῆμα, ἐν ᾧ τέως ἑωρᾶτο τὰ πράγματα, ἵνα μὴ λέγω ἢ κακία, ἀπεσκευάλετο, καὶ πρὸς καινὴν καὶ εὐτακτον μεταβολὴν . . . ἐξανίστατο.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 56 lines 16–21.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 60 lines 27–29: οἰκων ὧν μὲν ἐκ βάρβρων οἰκοδομαί, ὧν δὲ ἐπισκευῆς ἡξιωμένων πρὸς κάλλος μεταποιήσις.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 58 lines 26–28: . . . ὥς ἐκεῖνα, ἃ ποτὲ φασὶ χρυσᾷ ἔτη ἡ παλαιότης ἀνατεῖλαι, εἰς ταῦτα δοκεῖν αὐτὴν καταστῆναι.

<sup>104</sup> Bonn ed. (1834), 107 line 14–128 line 23. Genesius wrote his history sometime between 944 and 959; see Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, I (Berlin, 1958), 318. There may be some reason to believe that the work was written in the earlier half of this period; see F. Tinnefeld, *Kategorien der Kaiserkritik in der byzantinischen Historiographie von Prokop bis Niketas Choniates* (Munich, 1971), 91, with further references.

<sup>105</sup> Moravcsik, *op. cit.*, 380.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 130.

<sup>107</sup> Theophanes (*supra*, note 9), 166.

prudent, complaisant person, living unobtrusively in stirring times, exactly the character to submit gracefully to the ecclesiastical activity of his emperor."<sup>108</sup> Since there was no biography of Epiphanius, we have no reason to believe that Nicephorus knew more about him than we do. When he adds otherwise unknown details, such as that Epiphanius' father was called John (688A), or that after his father's death he was to become a monk and change his name (884C/D), I doubt that he is depending on historical facts. John was such a common name that Nicephorus may have borrowed it from anywhere, e.g., from Epiphanius' predecessor John II. Whether Bishop Epiphanius was a monk or not we do not know, nor is there any indication that Nicephorus knew either. Janning<sup>109</sup> and da Costa-Louillet<sup>110</sup> think that the change of name indicates that the Epiphanius of the *Vita* should be distinguished from the bishop of the same name. But the change of name is probably of little importance in this context. In the *Vita Evaristi*,<sup>111</sup> written in the first half of the tenth century, the holy man is called Evaristus right from the beginning, although at one moment<sup>112</sup> we are told that his original name was Sergius and that Evaristus was the name he got when he renounced the world. In the same way, Nicephorus calls Andreas' young friend Epiphanius, although he thinks that this is his monastic name, which he did not receive until after Andreas was dead.

Information on Bishop Epiphanius being scanty, Nicephorus probably turned to other models in order to get some more material for his portrait of this character. When he describes Epiphanius as a pious youth of noble Constantinopolitan stock, as περιφανῆς ἐν σοφίᾳ (684A), as a future monk, patriarch, and ὁμολογητής (884C/D), he may be using his contemporary, Patriarch Polyeuctus (956–70), as a model. Especially what Andreas says of Epiphanius' future in 884D seems to be a little too strong to have been inspired by the shadowy figure of the sixth-century bishop. Andreas' words are: καὶ τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης ἐκκλησίας χηρευσάσης, σε ἐγερεῖ κύριος φωστῆρα καὶ ὁδηγὸν καὶ ποιμένα τῶν πεπλανημένων ψυχῶν ἐμπειρότατον. μέλλεις δὲ καὶ εἰς ὁμολογίαν περὶ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔρχεσθαι καὶ σὺν ἁγίοις γενήσεται ὁ κληρὸς σου.<sup>113</sup> This prediction seems more appropriate to Polyeuctus than to Epiphanius. Having been a monk for many years, Polyeuctus succeeded the worldly patriarch Theophylactus in April 956. As a patriarch he was independent and outspoken to the extent that Constantine Porphyrogenitus is said to have repented his promotion.<sup>114</sup> It may further be noted that Polyeuctus is said to have been advanced in years at the time of the death of Romanus II (963).<sup>115</sup> This certainly means that his youth coincided with the reign of Leo VI, which would give a good parallel to the story of young Epiphanius under Leo I. On the whole, the

<sup>108</sup> W. Smith and H. Wase, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, II (London, 1880), 157.

<sup>109</sup> *Commentarius praeuius* (*supra*, note 3), col. 622.

<sup>110</sup> *Op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 180.

<sup>111</sup> *BHG*<sup>3</sup>, 2153.

<sup>112</sup> *Vita Evaristi*, ed. C. van de Vorst, *AnalBoll*, 41 (1923), 302 line 36.

<sup>113</sup> Text according to the recension most closely related to the uncial fragment (cf. 884D).

<sup>114</sup> Scylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn (Berlin, 1973), 244.

<sup>115</sup> Leo Diaconus, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1828), 32 lines 23–24.



moralizing, strictly orthodox tendency of the *Vita*<sup>116</sup> is well in line with Polyeuctus' austere, moralizing character. The fictitious writer of the *Vita* is supposed to belong to the clergy of St. Sophia (888C). If this reflects the position of the *real* author, it is a fair guess that he knew Polyeuctus and was impressed by his strong personality. On the other hand, as he also seems to have had a high opinion of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (cf. *infra*), I would not go as far as Janning, who simply identified Epiphanius with Polyeuctus, or, alternately, with Antonius (974–79), whose character was similar.<sup>117</sup> In my view, we should limit ourselves to saying that the portrait of Epiphanius *may* contain some features that derive from Polyeuctus. If so, the *Life of Andreas Salos* may not have been written until 956 or later, although I cannot find any *reliable* terminus post quem after *ca.* 950.

#### V. "CONSTANTINE THE GREAT"

Since the terminus post quem seems to fall within the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (945–59), it might be worth seeing if Constantine VII can be compared to any of the Byzantine emperors described in the eschatological section of the *Vita*.<sup>118</sup> If the answer is yes, we may also be able to find the terminus ante quem. It is not as unreasonable to look for such a connection as I once thought. According to Nicephorus, the reign of the first eschatological ruler will be happy. In his time, men will enjoy themselves, unaware of the approaching disaster. Nicephorus seems to be writing in the reign of a successful emperor, indirectly warning his contemporaries that the current prosperity might be deceptive. The extremely moralizing tone of the *Vita* agrees with this message. Now, although the Byzantine Empire enjoyed relative prosperity during Constantine's reign, we know that the apocalyptic feeling was still there. A certain Gregory, author of the *Vita Basilii iunioris*,<sup>119</sup> written, it would seem, between 956 and 959,<sup>120</sup> thinks that he is writing ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.<sup>121</sup> Toward the end of the same *Vita* Christ is heard saying: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ παραγίνομαι καὶ ὁ μισθός μου ἅμα ἐμοί, καὶ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐμῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς (read ὑμᾶς) δευτέρως ἐλεύσεως, καὶ μακάριοι ἐστε ἐὰν ἐτοίμους καὶ γρηγοροῦντας εὐρήσω ὑμᾶς.<sup>122</sup> Thus, in Constantine's reign, pious men kept warning that the end was drawing near.

A look at the eschatological section of our *Vita* shows that the final drama will begin with the succession of five different emperors, the first of whom will be good and will reign for thirty-two years. The two following emperors

<sup>116</sup> See Grosdidier de Matons' excellent analysis, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6).

<sup>117</sup> *Commentarius praeuius* (*supra*, note 3), cols. 623–24.

<sup>118</sup> 853B–860C. For the text, see *supra*, note 1.

<sup>119</sup> BHG<sup>3</sup>, 263–64; see also Rydén, "The Church of St. Anastasia" (*supra*, note 9), 198 note 2.

<sup>120</sup> H. Grégoire and P. Orgels, "L'invasion hongroise dans la 'Vie de Saint Basile le Jeune,'" *Byzantion*, 24 (1954), 147–54.

<sup>121</sup> Ed. S. Vilinskij, *Žitie sv. Vasilija Novago v' russkoj literaturě*. II, Zapiski imperatorskago novorossijskago universiteta, istoriko-filologičeskago fakul'teta (Odessa, 1911), 311 line 16, 316 line 35.

<sup>122</sup> Ed. A. Veselovskij, "Razvskanija v' oblasti russkago duhovnago stiha," *XVIII–XXIV, Sbornik' otdělenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoj akademii nauk'*, LIII, no. 6, suppl. (St. Petersburg, 1891), 169.

will be evil, one being an incarnation of Antichrist and the other a convert to paganism. The fourth and the fifth will be good again. The former will come from Ethiopia and reign in peace for twelve years, whereas the latter will come from Arabia and reign for only one year. At the end of his reign he will go to Jerusalem and surrender the imperial power to God. As I have tried to show elsewhere,<sup>123</sup> the first, second, third, and fifth of these emperors represent the legendary history of the first four Byzantine emperors, i.e., the history of Constantine the Great, Constantius, Julian the Apostate, and Jovian, put into future tense. Between the third and the fifth emperor, Nicephorus has inserted a ruler reminiscent of Alexander the Great. Now, if Nicephorus describes the beginning of the end of the world as a repetition of the earliest history of the Byzantine Empire, it seems unlikely that he also has a succession of later Byzantine emperors in mind. If there is any correspondence between Nicephorus' eschatological system and later Byzantine history, I think it is restricted to a parallel between the first eschatological ruler ("Constantine the Great") and the emperor in whose reign the *Vita* was written.

As we have already seen, "Constantine the Great" is remarkably similar to Basil I as he is portrayed in the *Vita Basilii*. The reason for this similarity cannot be that Nicephorus regarded Basil's reign as the beginning of the end. Nicephorus lived more than half a century later than Basil I. Thus, if "Constantine the Great" stands for Basil I, "Constantius" stands for Leo VI, "Julian" for Alexander, "Alexander the Great" and "Jovian" for Constantine Porphyrogenitus and Romanus I; and this is, of course, extremely improbable.<sup>124</sup> The reason is rather that Nicephorus knew the *Vita Basilii* and borrowed certain features from it for his portrait of the first eschatological ruler. He did not confine himself, however, to simply copying Constantine Porphyrogenitus' picture of his grandfather. As Paul J. Alexander has demonstrated, the Byzantine theory of kingship as expressed in the *Vita Basilii* is derived from Constantine the Great and his circle.<sup>125</sup> Nicephorus seems to have been aware of this connection. At any rate he went beyond the portrait of Basil I and depicted the first eschatological ruler as an incarnation of Constantine the Great himself. In so doing, he reinterpreted Isaac's prophecy and gave it an up-to-date meaning: the emperor of the prophecy was no longer Basil but Constantine the Great, i.e., I think, Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the guise of Constantine the Great.

One reason why Constantine VII portrayed his grandfather as the ideal Christian emperor and even claimed that he was a descendant of Constantine the Great on Basil's mother's side was certainly that he wanted to strengthen the legitimacy of the Macedonian dynasty. Constantine also seems to have

<sup>123</sup> "Zum Aufbau der Andreas Salos-Apokalypse," *Eranos*, 66 (1968), 101-17.

<sup>124</sup> Passages such as Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De thematibus*, ed. A. Pertusi, ST, 160 (Vatican City, 1952), 75 line 2: ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τοῦ μακαρίτου καὶ ἁγίου μου πατρός, show how absurd it would be to compare Leo VI to an evil apocalyptic ruler.

<sup>125</sup> P. J. Alexander, "The Strength of Empire and Capital as Seen Through Byzantine Eyes," *Speculum*, 37 (1962), 339-57, esp. 348-54. For the same theory appearing in the *Life of Andreas Salos*, see Rydén, "The Andreas Salos Apocalypse" (*supra*, note 1), 239-41.

referred to Constantine the Great in his dealings with foreign nations. In the famous thirteenth chapter of the *De Administrando Imperio*,<sup>126</sup> he tells his son Romanus not to accept the demands of the barbarians for imperial crowns and dresses, for Greek fire, and for marriage alliances with the imperial family, and recommends that he refer his refusal to the authority of Constantine the Great. The crowns and the dresses had been sent to Constantine the Great by God Himself, Constantine says, and, following the will of God, Constantine the Great had put them in the sanctuary of St. Sophia, whence they could not be taken away except temporarily on certain occasions. God had also confided to Constantine the Great the secret of the Greek fire, and he (Constantine the Great) had therefore ordered a curse to be inscribed on the altar of St. Sophia "that he who should dare to give of this fire to another nation should neither be called a Christian, nor be held worthy of any rank or office."<sup>127</sup> In the same way the curse of Constantine the Great befell any emperor who allied himself in marriage "with a nation of customs differing from and alien to those of the Roman order," the Franks excepted, "because he himself drew his origin from those parts."<sup>128</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus doubtless knew that these excuses were anachronistic,<sup>129</sup> but in his vision of the Byzantine Empire he combined past and present without scruple. He thus created a timeless, ideal picture of the empire which he could use to his advantage in his dealings with foreign nations.<sup>130</sup> It is also interesting to note that Liudprand, who visited Constantinople in 949, says that the part of the imperial palace called Porphyra, in which Constantine Porphyrogenitus was born, had been built by Constantine the Great.<sup>131</sup> According to Liudprand, it was Constantine the Great who had expressed the wish that his offspring should be born there and be called Porphyrogeniti. In the opinion of many, Liudprand adds, Constantine Porphyrogenitus was in fact descended from Constantine the Great. This seems to be just another example of Constantine

<sup>126</sup> Greek text ed. Gy. Moravcsik, English translation R. J. H. Jenkins, DOT, I (Washington, D. C., 1967). According to the internal evidence, the *De Administrando Imperio* was written between 948 and 952 (cf. intro., 11).

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 69f. These anachronisms are in line with the fact that neither Nicephorus nor Constantine of Rhodes dwell upon the history of St. Sophia.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 71.

<sup>129</sup> As Alexander, "The Strength of Empire," 347, observes, Constantine Porphyrogenitus says in chapter 48 of the same work that the Greek fire was invented in the reign of Constantine IV Pogonatus (668–85). Cf. also C. Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzügen* (Heidelberg, 1894), 3.

<sup>130</sup> There is a similar anachronism in the well-known mosaic representing the Virgin and Child, surrounded by Justinian I and Constantine the Great, in the southwest vestibule of St. Sophia. It shows Justinian I bringing a model of St. Sophia and Constantine the Great bringing a model of Constantinople to the Virgin. In reality, St. Sophia was dedicated to the Divine Wisdom, i.e., to Christ, whereas Constantinople was dedicated to Constantine the Great himself; for the latter, see Dagron, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 16), 42. The Virgin did not become the particular protectress of Constantinople until the seventh century. The exact date of the mosaic is unknown. Estimates range from the middle of the tenth century to the first quarter of the eleventh. To me a date around 950 seems likely, since it would fit the exploitation of the name of Constantine the Great in the *De Administrando Imperio*. It would also fit the words "for she (the City) has been given to the Mother of God and no one will snatch her out of her hands" in the prelude to the prophecy of the end of the world in the *Life of Andreas Salos* (853B).

<sup>131</sup> Liudprand, *Antapodosis* (*supra*, note 77) I.6–7.

Porphyrogenitus' anachronistic references to Constantine the Great, especially as the Porphyra does not appear in our sources until the eighth century.<sup>132</sup>

Furthermore, as Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his portrait of Basil I alluded to the image of Constantine the Great, so Constantine himself was compared to the first Christian emperor. He was even found to be his superior, as we learn from the preface to the *Geoponica*, an encyclopedic work that almost certainly was compiled on the initiative of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The anonymous author addresses himself to τὸ τερπνὸν τῆς πορφύρας ἀπάνθισμα, i.e., no doubt, to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and says, among other things: "Disdaining the pursuits of the other emperors, you have competed with the first emperor of the Christians, with Constantine, the founder and protector of this city, whom you have left far behind you, thanks to your beautiful works, your triumphs, your victories, and your other achievements."<sup>133</sup> Now, if the compiler of the *Geoponica* could compare Constantine Porphyrogenitus to Constantine the Great, Nicephorus can certainly be supposed to have drawn the same parallel. Constantine's successors, Romanus II (959–63), Nicephorus Phocas (963–69), John Tzimiscēs (969–76), and Basil II (976–1025), are much less likely to have inspired a comparison with Constantine the Great. Unlike Constantine, they did not carry the same name as the first Christian emperor. They did not share his interest in history, nor did they have the same reason to support their legitimacy by claiming to be descendants of the founder of Constantinople. On the other hand, it seems utterly unlikely that Nicephorus would have depicted any of these emperors as a new Constantius, who is presented as an incarnation of Antichrist because he was an Arian, or as a new Julian the Apostate. Thus, if we accept the idea that there is a connection between Nicephorus' eschatological vision and the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, we must conclude that the *Life of Andreas Salos* was written before Constantine died in November 959. To my mind, the paragraph on "Constantine the Great" is a kind of prophecy *ex eventu*; with "Constantius" the real prophecy begins.

## VI. THE *Life of Andreas Salos* AND THE HEBREW *Vision of Daniel*

This interpretation is supported by a Hebrew version of the *Vision of Daniel* discovered in Cairo and recently translated into English by A. Sharf.<sup>134</sup> The anonymous author of this vision says that in the reign of Chosroes, King of Persia, the Archangel Gabriel appeared to Daniel and revealed to him what would happen at the end of days. In those days, he said, there will arise a blasphemous king who will mock priests and anger the Most High by his

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* (*supra*, note 13), 121.

<sup>133</sup> Σὺ γὰρ μικρὰ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων σπουδάσματα λογισάμενος πρὸς μόνον ἐκείνον ἡμιλλήθης τὸν πρῶτον Χριστιανῶν βασιλέα, Κωνσταντίνον φημι τὸν ταύτης οἰκιστὴν τε καὶ πολιοῦχον, ὃν καὶ πολλὰ τῶ μέσῳ παρήλασας ἔργοις παλλίστοις (read καλλίστοις) καὶ τροπαίοις καὶ νίκαις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀριστεύμασιν' *Geoponica*, ed. H. Beckh (Leipzig, 1895), 1 lines 10–15.

<sup>134</sup> A. Sharf, "A Source for Byzantine Jewry under the Early Macedonians," *BNJbb*, 20 (1970), 302–18, esp. 303–6.

deeds. But God will slay him for the evil of his doings and set another king in his place, a king whose tribe will be exalted from its former state. The sign of his name will be the two B's. He will enrich his kingdom with great riches, he will conquer nations and bring peoples under his sway. He will baptize the Jews by force. He will die in his bed in great agony and pass his scepter to his son, whose name will be the sign of royalty for beasts. Together with him there will reign two uncrowned men, one after the other, the first being a dark one who will reign peacefully for twenty-two seasons, the second being an Arab who will give the king bad advice but not succeed. After him there will arise a king who will reign with four other crowned kings, all from the same family. But he, too, will die, and from the same house (as the king with the lion's name) there will reign a king whom many foes will try to ensnare, but they will not succeed, for he will be worthy of (divine) protection. At the beginning of his reign his kingdom will prosper and be exalted to the skies, but in the last days it will be destroyed. This dynasty will not fall, i.e., I understand, the dynasty of the king of the two B's will be the last Christian dynasty. It will enjoy its possessions peacefully and the land will be filled with good things. Then the son of wickedness will appear from the North and rule over the land of Aftalopon<sup>135</sup> three seasons and a half season. He will commit sins, the like of which have not been committed from the creation of the world to its end, for he will join in marriage sons with their mothers, brothers with their sisters, and daughters with their fathers, and so forth.

It should appear from this summary of Sharf's translation that, as Sharf and the commentators quoted by him have observed, the anonymous apocalypticist is referring to Byzantine history from Michael III to Constantine VII. His message evidently is that Constantine VII will be the last Christian emperor. At the end of this emperor's reign, Antichrist will appear from the North, i.e., from the land of Gog and Magog, and the tribulations will begin. This indicates that the author is writing between 945 and 959.<sup>136</sup> Like Nicephorus he seems to be relying on the *Vita Basilii* for certain details. As Isaac, according to the *Vita Basilii*, made his prophecy 350 years before the elevation of Basil I, so Gabriel appeared to Daniel in the reign of Chosroes, King of Persia—presumably Chosroes I (531–79). Like the Macedonian dynasty in the *Vita Basilii*, the tribe of the king of the two B's will be "exalted from its former state." The contrast between the king of the two B's and his predecessor corresponds to the contrast between Michael III and Basil I in the *Vita Basilii*.

There are also other signs that, somehow, the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel* and the *Life of Andreas Salos* are related to each other. Speaking of Con-

<sup>135</sup> Aftalopon (Ἐπτάλοφος) is Constantinople, not Rome, as Sharf thinks. There is no indication that the capital will be moved from Constantinople at this stage of the drama.

<sup>136</sup> Sharf, *op. cit.*, 316 note 80, assumes that the apocalypse was written not long after the death of Constantine VII, since he is the last Byzantine emperor mentioned. But apocalyptic texts are normally supposed to be written *before* the death of the last ruler they refer to. The fact that Messiah, according to the anonymous author, will reign in Byzantium can hardly be understood as an allusion to the victories of Nicephorus Phocas and John Tzimiscas, as Sharf suggests (*ibid.*, 317).

stantine VII, Gabriel says that "many foes will gather about him to ensnare him but their counsel will be frustrated for he will be worthy of (divine) protection." This looks like a summary of the words with which Andreas begins his prophecy of the end of the world: "About our city you shall know: Until the end she will fear no nation whatsoever, for no one will entrap or capture her, not by any means, for she has been given to the Mother of God and no one will snatch her out of her hands. Many nations will break their horns against her walls and withdraw with shame, receiving from her gifts and great wealth." Very remarkable is the similarity between Leo's two uncrowned coregents in the *Vision* and the fourth and fifth rulers in the prophecy of the *Vita*. In the *Vita* "the man from Ethiopia" is followed by a ruler from Arabia, and in the *Vision* "a dark one" is followed by an Arab. "The man from Ethiopia" is an incarnation of Alexander the Great, and as such, it is said, he will reign for twelve years. One would expect "the dark one" to reign for twelve years as well, and not for twenty-two, but the anonymous author seems to have mixed up the number of Alexander's years with the number of dirty peoples which Alexander, according to tradition, had shut up in the North. In both the *Vita* and the *Vision* the former of the two figures has been badly integrated into the context. In the *Vita*, "Alexander the Great" is an intruder into the series "Constantine the Great," "Constantius," "Julian," and "Jovian." In the *Vision*, "the dark one" does not seem to correspond to any historical figure, whereas the Arab can easily be identified with Leo's well-known chamberlain Samonas, who was an Arab.<sup>137</sup> Also, the second ruler in the *Vita* ("Constantius") and the ruler following upon Constantine VII in the *Vision* are very similar. Both are described as forerunners of Antichrist. They will reign for three years and a half. In their days father will have intercourse with daughter, son with mother, and brother with sister. God will send thunder and lightning and the cities will burn. In those days happy are those who live in Rome, Riza, Armenopetra, Strobilos, and Karioupolis (*Vita*, 857B), or "in Rome and in Salonica, in Sicily and in Beroia, in Shtriglion and in Ashiniad, in Aram and in Istambolin" (?) (*Vision*).

The writer of the *Vision* is quite explicit about his belief that, after Constantine VII, the eschatological drama will begin. By describing five easily identifiable emperors, starting with Michael III and ending with Constantine VII,<sup>138</sup> he clearly demonstrates when he thinks that the end will come. In comparison with the prophecy *ex eventu*, he devotes little space to his real prophecy. In the eschatological section of the *Vita*, on the other hand, the prophecy *ex eventu* is much shorter than the real prophecy. Instead of preparing his readers with a series of clearly recognizable emperors, Nicephorus mentions only the last real emperor, whom he disguises as Constantine the Great so that he becomes hard to identify. I think, however, that the similarities between the *Vision* and the *Vita* show that Nicephorus is using the

<sup>137</sup> To Sharf and the authorities quoted by him (*ibid.*, 312 and note 55) the man from Arabia is as mysterious as "the dark one." They do not consider the possibility of identifying him with Samonas.

<sup>138</sup> References to Alexander (912-13) are lacking.

same material as the author of the *Vision* (a current version of the *Vision of Daniel*<sup>139</sup> and the historiography of Constantine VII and his circle) and expresses the same view (after Constantine VII the end will begin). To my mind, this in turn indicates that he is writing at the same time.

## VII. THE UNCIAL FRAGMENT

It has been suggested above<sup>140</sup> that the uncial fragment contained in the Monacensis gr. 443 is the surviving tenth quire of the original MS in which Nicephorus tried to support the historical fiction of the *Vita* by imitating sixth-century writing. It has also been mentioned that the imitation is inconsistent. It is obviously not the result of a careful study of a real sixth-century codex. What Nicephorus is in fact imitating is rather the archaizing Coptic uncial of the tenth century. For certain details his models may very well have been the elegant minuscule MSS produced at Constantinople in the middle of the century. The breathings are comparatively small and mostly of the cursive round type, less often angular, and rarely in the form of one half of the letter H. As is well known, this mixture of round and angular breathings is typical of many MSS written in the middle and the second half of the tenth century, when round breathings become increasingly frequent. The characteristic left hook that terminates the vertical stroke of the letters P, Φ, and Ψ also appears in the semimajuscule headings of Mt. Athos, Dionysiou 70, written in 955 by the *notarius* Nicephorus for Constantine Porphyrogenitus' brother-in-law Basil.<sup>141</sup> The number and heading of chapter 32 on folio IV<sup>v</sup>, reproduced here, are red, as are the starlike ornament at the end of the heading and the initial E of the first word of the chapter. Both the star and the initial are very simple. Nevertheless, they are strikingly similar to the stars and initials in the luxurious Hippatrika-MS in Berlin, Phill. 1538, written for Constantine Porphyrogenitus, it would seem,<sup>142</sup> and in the famous Gospel Book Parisinus gr. 70, probably written in 964.<sup>143</sup> The star also appears, e.g., in Vaticanus gr. 124, written at Constantinople in 947,<sup>144</sup> and the initial also in the MS written by the *notarius* Nicephorus mentioned above.<sup>145</sup>

It cannot be proved on paleographical grounds alone that the uncial fragment was written at Constantinople in the fifties of the tenth century. It may be said, however, that both the writing and the ornamentation fit the date and provenance which the observations made in the previous sections imply.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Liudprand, *Legatio* (*supra*, note 77), chap. 39: *Habent Greci et Saraceni libros, quos ὀράσεις sive visiones Danielis vocant, ego autem Sibyllanos, in quibus scriptum reperitur, quot annis imperator quisque vivat; quae sint futura eo imperante tempora, pax an simulas, secundae Saracenorum res an adversae.*

<sup>140</sup> *Supra*, p. 132.

<sup>141</sup> K. and S. Lake, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, III (Boston, 1935), pl. 154.

<sup>142</sup> K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des IX. und X. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1935), 16f.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>144</sup> A. Diller, "Notes on Greek Codices of the Tenth Century," *TAPA*, 78 (1947), 184–88, pl. 1. For the provenance, see J. Irigoin, "Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins (suite)," *Scriptorium*, 13 (1959), 177–209, esp. 195.

<sup>145</sup> Lake, *loc. cit.*

## VIII. OTHER OBSERVATIONS

It would seem that the general character of the *Vita* is in support of a date within the reign of Constantine VII. The *Vita* is an unusually long and comprehensive work. In its way it is surprisingly learned. It not only tells us about the deeds and behavior of Andreas Salos, it also asks and answers a series of questions of a quasi-scientific kind such as: from where do the clouds get their rain? Why is the snow white? What is the soul made of? How is Paradise? What is hell like? When will the world come to an end, and how? Thus the *Life of Andreas Salos* is not only a saint's *Life* but also a kind of encyclopedia corresponding to the different encyclopedic enterprises instigated by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. On a popular level it seems to me to reflect the intellectual atmosphere radiating from the imperial palace in his reign.

There is also an unmistakable affinity between the *Life of Andreas Salos* and the *Vita Basilii iunioris*.<sup>146</sup> They are both long, comprehensive texts, written in unpretentious Byzantine Greek and showing the same characteristic mixture of saint's *Life* and apocalyptic treatise. The moralizing element is strong in both cases. Andreas is a *salos*, and Basil is sometimes said to behave like a *salos*. They both live and die in Constantinople, although their origins were far away, Scythia in the case of Andreas, the backwoods of Asia Minor in the case of Basil the Younger. The author of the *Vita Basilii iunioris*, a certain Gregory, is not known outside the frame of this text, nor is Nicephorus known otherwise than through the *Life of Andreas Salos*, although it seems likely that the authors of these extensive texts also wrote other works. It appears from their publications as we know them, however, that they belonged to the same intellectual milieu and had similar interests. They both knew Constantinople well, and they both seem to have been familiar with the hagiographical works of Leontius of Neapolis.<sup>147</sup> As Germaine da Costa-Louillet says, the *Life of Andreas Salos* and the *Vita Basilii iunioris* "semblent baigner dans la même atmosphère."<sup>148</sup> It has already been mentioned that the latter appears to have been written between 956 and 959.

Finally, a brief remark on the name of the author. According to 888C, the fictitious author of the *Vita* was a priest at St. Sophia called Nicephorus. Is this applicable to the real author too? At least as far as the name is concerned, there is room for doubt. The historical fiction implies that the real author denied authorship of the *Vita* and pretended that he had discovered a hitherto unknown Early Byzantine document. The credibility of this document would have suffered if the discoverer had been the fictitious author's namesake. People would have wondered at such a coincidence. For practical reasons, I have called the real author by the name of the fictitious one, but it should be borne in mind that his true name probably was different.<sup>149</sup>

<sup>146</sup> *Supra*, note 119.

<sup>147</sup> Da Costa-Louillet, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6), 202 note 2.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 182. She also points out that these two saints' *Lives* sometimes appear in the same MSS.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Maas, *loc. cit.* (*supra*, note 6).



## IX. CONCLUSION

On the basis of these observations, it may be concluded that the *Life of Andreas Salos* was written between the time of the composition of the *Vita Basilii* and the death of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, i.e., in the sixth decade of the tenth century. The fictitious date of the *Vita* seems to derive from the story of Isaac's vision and the Armenian origin of the Macedonian dynasty.